1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
3	
4	
5	
6	In re:) Civil 05-MD-1708 (DWF/AJB)
7 8	GUIDANT CORPORATION) STATUS CONFERENCE IMPLANTABLE DEFIBRILLATOR) PRODUCTS LIABILITY) LITIGATION,)
9)
10 11	This Document Relates) To All Actions) 9:30 o'clock, a.m.) April 19, 2006
12) Minneapolis, Minnesota
13	
14	
15	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE DONOVAN W. FRANK AND
16	THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE ARTHUR J. BOYLAN
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE AND MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18	CIVIL STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
19	
20	
21	* * *
22	
23	JEANNE M. ANDERSON
24	Registered Merit Reporter Suite 646, 316 North Robert Street
25	St. Paul, Minnesota 55101 (651) 848-1221

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	LEAD PLAINTIFF COUNSEL	:
4		
5		Richard Arsenault, Esq. Neblett, Beard & Arsenault
6		2200 Bonaventure Court Alexandria, LA 71301
7		(318) 487-9874
8	And	
9		
10		Elizabeth Cabraser, Esq. Wendy Fleishman, Esq.
11		Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Berstein, LLP
12		275 Battery Street, 30th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
13		(415) 956-1000
14	And	
15		
16		Seth R. Lesser, Esq. Locks Law Firm, PLLC
17		110 East 55th Street New York, NY 10022 (212) 838-3333
18 19		(212) 030-3333
20	And	
21		Charles S. Zimmerman, Esq.
22		Zimmerman Reed 651 Nicollet Mall, Suite 501
23		Minneapolis, MN 55402-4123 (612) 341-0400
24		
25		

ſ		
1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2	:	
3	PLAINTIFF LIAISON COUNSEL:	
4	:	
5		rles S. Zimmerman, Esq. merman Reed
6	651	Nicollet Mall, Suite 501 neapolis, MN 55402-4123
7		2) 341-0400
8		
9	·	* * *
10		
11		ald Goldser, Esq. ert R. Hopper, Esq.
12	? Time	othy Beckner, Esq. merman Reed
13 14	651 Min	Nicollet Mall, Suite 501 neapolis, MN 55402-4123 2) 341-0400
15		2) 311 3133
16	And	
17		e D. Pearson, Esq.
18	400	rson, Randall & Schumacher, PA S. 4th Street, Suite 1012 neapolis, MN 55415
19		2) 332-0351
20	And	
21		
22		vija A. Strikis, Esq. logg, Huber, Hansen
23	Tode	d, Evans & Figel, PLLC ner Square
24	161	5 M Street, N.W. te 400
25	Was	hington, D.C. 20036 2) 326-7939

1	APPEARANCES (Continued	1):
2		
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:	Daniel E Begnel In Egg
4	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS.	Daniel E. Becnel, Jr., Esq. The Law Offices of Daniel E. Becnel, Jr.
5		106 W. 7th Street P.O. Drawer H
6		Reserve, LA 70084 (985) 536-1186
7		(903) 330-1100
8	And	
9		Lauren Guth Barnes, Esq.
10		Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP Attorneys at Law
11		One Main Street, Fourth Floor Cambridge, MA 02142
12		(617) 482-3700
13	And	
14		
15		Michael K. Johnson, Esq. Goldenberg & Johnson PLLC
16		Attorneys at Law 33 South 6th Street, Suite 4530
17		Minneapolis, MN 55402 (612) 333-4662
18		(
19	And	
20		Joseph Crosby, Esq.
21		Crosby Law Office 952 Grand Avenue
22		St. Paul, MN 55116 (651) 225-1860
23		(
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2		Gerence S. Ziegler, Esq.
3	2	Schiffrin & Barroway LLP 280 King Of Prussia Road
4		Radnor, PA 19087 610) 822-2205
5 6	And	
7	And	
8	S	Chris Seeger, Esq. Seeger, Weiss, LLP
9	N	One William Street New York, NY 10004 212) 584-0700
10	,	212) 301 0700
11	And	
12		Geresa C. Toriseva, Esq.
13 14	Н 8	Hill, Toriseva & Williams, PLLC By Twelfth Street Wheeling, West Virginia 19103
	W	meering, west virginia 19103
15 16	And	
17	к	Carren Schaeffer, Esq.
18	R 1	Robinson, Calcagnie & Robinson 10 Laurel Street
19		San Diego, CA 92101 619) 338-4060
20		
21	And	
22		Greg Jones, Esq.
23	3	Greg Jones & Associates 3015 Market Street Wilmington, NC 28403
24		910) 251-2240
25		

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: Neil	Overholtz, Esq. Bayou Boulevard
4	Suit Pens	e 58 acola, FL 32503-2673
5) 916-7450
6	5	
7	7	
8	3	
9	9	
10		
11		
12	2	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17 18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	4	
25	5	

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	
3	LEAD DEFENDANT COUNSEL:
4	
5	Timothy A. Pratt, Esq. Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP 2555 Grand Boulevard
6	2555 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108-6550 (816) 474-6550
7	(010) 4/4-0220
8	
9	LIAISON DEFENDANT COUNSEL:
10	
11	Joseph M. Price, Esq.
12	Faegre & Benson 2200 Wells Fargo Center
13	90 South 7th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3901
14	(612) 766-7000
15	
16	* * *
17	
18	FOR THE DEFENDANT:
19	
20	John Sherk, Esq.
21 22	Andrew D. Carpenter, Esq. Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP 2555 Grand Boulevard
23	Kansas City, MO 64108-6550 (816) 474-6550
24	(313) 1/1 333
25	
-	

(In open court.)

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: You may be seated. Thank you.

I apologize for the late start. Before we came into the courtroom, Judge Boylan and I discussed the dates, so before we hopefully receive a summary from both Plaintiffs and Defendant on the status of the case, or cases, let me suggest a couple of dates, and maybe a couple of other -- not really announcements, but observations.

We have been having, as most of you know -and we try to put them up on the website in between the
conferences, like this one -- we have a telephone
conference that is usually an hour in length. They have
been, except for the first one. We would suggest -- we
have been trying to do those, realizing some people are
up rather early because of the time zone you may be in,
Tuesday, May 2nd from 8:00 to 9:00 in the morning, how
would that complicate lead counsel's life?

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I can't do that one, Your

Honor. I am in a status conference, but there are

plenty people on my side that can handle it. So, I

think if that date works for the Defense, that would be

fine.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Mr. Pratt or Mr.

```
1
    Price?
2
                MR. PRATT: May 2nd?
 3
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Yeah, at 8:00 or
4
    9:00 in the morning, Central Standard Time. That would
    be the telephone conference.
5
                MR. PRATT: Yes, Your Honor, we will work
6
7
    that out. If that is good with you all, we will make it
8
    work.
9
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: We have two that can attend,
10
    so that is fine.
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.
11
    next conference for here in beautiful Downtown
12
13
    Minneapolis is Wednesday, May 17th. What is that date?
    That is the third Wednesday in May.
14
15
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: That is great for our side,
16
    Your Honor. I see a lot of heads shaking, so that works
    for us.
17
18
                MR. PRATT: My daughter is graduating from
19
    SMU that weekend. It really has nothing to do with
20
    scheduling. I just wanted to say that so I can tell her
21
    I said it at an MDL hearing. My daughter is graduating
22
    from SMU that weekend.
23
                (Applause.)
24
                MR. PRATT: Thank you.
25
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Which weekend is
```

```
Which weekend?
1
    it?
2
                MR. PRATT: Well, it is on the 20th.
 3
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, just let me
    say to you, Mr. Pratt, I have five daughters, two sets
4
    of twins. I have three in college. So, that is why I
5
    was offering to make coffee this morning to make up a
6
7
    little change, but my oldest daughter is graduating from
8
    the University of St. Thomas on May 20th, as well.
    So --
9
10
                (Applause.)
11
                MR. LESSER: Could the record reflect the
12
    applause?
13
                MR. PRATT: Judge, I won't be able to go to
    your daughter's graduation.
14
15
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.
                                                         Ι
16
    won't be at yours, either.
                MR. PRATT: Actually, after all of that, the
17
18
    17th, Wednesday, though my wife has ambitious plans for
19
    me, I think Wednesday the 17th is free.
20
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We don't want to
21
    interfere with the graduation. But, Mr. Price, you were
22
    trying to get into the --
23
                MR. PRICE: I was just going to say that the
24
    record should reflect that not only was the Judge making
25
    coffee, but he was selling it.
```

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: So, we will go with that date. Same schedule, 8:00 to 9:15. Just keep an eye on the website. It will probably be in the 15th floor conference room again. And just stay tuned on the courtroom because, as you know, that has moved. be here in Minneapolis, of course.

One or two other issues before hearing kind of an overview or summary from each respective group of lawyers. As you know, I had agreed at the last hearing, and actually it occurred in the afternoon, or actually the late morning, over the noon hour, the motions on remand. And the agreement we had to kind of move things along was to get out a sentence or two or a page order with a memorandum opinion to follow. That will be out shortly. I define shortly as ten days or less, probably less, because of some other commitments on cases I have, because we have asked some folks just to stay tuned until that came out. But, maybe we will have a short chat today from one side of the aisle or the other about the tolling issues.

Other than that, why don't we defer to counsel unless, Judge Boylan, you had anything?

> THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: No.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: We can start with Plaintiff, if that is acceptable to everyone?

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PRATT: Sure.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And the record should reflect we did in fact meet this morning from 8:00 to 9:10, or thereabouts.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I have no daughters graduating from college, unfortunately, so I am not in that club.

Your Honor, the agenda was provided to the Court, I believe, on Monday and posted on the website and filed. It has six items on it. I think I will make my comments on number one, and the Defense can make theirs and we can kind of go back and forth that way if that meets with the Court's approval.

The first one is number and status of cases transferred into the MDL. According to Plaintiffs' records, there are 232. I think according to Defense, there are 207. I don't know if it is necessary to go into too much of the particulars on that, because they do catch up here when they catch up. The bottom line is there are about 220 or so cases that are going to be finding their way here based upon the records of the judicial panel.

One of those cases that is probably of interest to people is the Switzer litigation in New

York. That is subject to a motion right now in New York before the Federal Judge there as to whether or not it will be brought here or not. We don't know the outcome of that, but that is probably the most significant of the tag-along cases.

and have tag-alongs and are subject to hold periods. I don't know that that is all that important for purposes of this discussion today, but what is important is that everyone know that when your case comes to this Court and when your case does get transferred here, there is an obligation under the plaintiff fact sheet to get your plaintiff fact sheets in.

We had a long discussion about plaintiff fact sheets, and I want the record to reflect that it is the PSC and the LCC, Lead Counsel Committee's point of view that it is very important to get those in timely. And that those that are not timely and those that are not substantially complete will hear from us to do so as quickly as possible. It is a very important issue for the Court, it is an important issue for the Plaintiffs Steering Committee and it is an important issue for the Defense. So, that is the report on cases transferred to the MDL. We may have a comment.

MR. PRATT: Good morning, Your Honor. I have

done sort of a recalculation of cases now because we did get some decisions from the Multi-District Panel on some oppositions to the Conditional Transfer Orders. According to the numbers we have on the Defense side, there are now 210 total cases actually here, committed There are 42 pending transfers that are in the MDL. part of the tag-alongs that we have filed. There are five oppositions to conditional transfer orders that are still pending to be considered by the Multi-District Panel. One of them, as Mr. Zimmerman said, is the Spitzer matter out in New York. So, that is the total number of cases sort of in the MDL. 210 are sort of hopefully on their way to the MDL.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are a total of 27 cases in State Court, presently. The Texas trials that were set for a couple of weeks ago were continued. There are no new trial date in the Texas cases. We have no State Court trials set anywhere until August of this year.

So, that's where things stand. I agree with Mr. Zimmerman that I think that there is discovery that is proceeding to pace. There are certain things the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee and Lead Counsel believe to be critical. From the Defense standpoint, one of the most critical aspects that we believe we need and are not getting involve plaintiff fact sheets.

There are about 59 Plaintiffs in the MDL for whom we have no fact sheets, in violation of the pretrial orders that have been submitted. We are talking to the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee about how to deal with those deficiencies, even those that have been filed and submitted in a relatively timely fashion, several of those are incomplete.

2.0

We are debating with them over the deficiencies and hope to get that information. That, on the defense side, is critical information that we need to be able to proceed with the Court's deadlines for setting bellwether cases for trial. And we are working with the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee to get it.

anything more other than we had this extensive discussion, and we are on schedule. And we want everybody on the train, because we are not going to slow it down for other Plaintiffs, since we have some dates and we are going to hold to those that end up in trying cases no later than March of this next year.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Your Honor, the subpart of that is we are in negotiations with the Defense for a tolling agreement, which may slow down filings if we are successful in having a tolling agreement, which would allow people to not have to file cases, but get in under

a tolling. We have not resolved it yet. We believe we are there. We have a good faith effort to negotiate, and we hope to have that secured within a very short period of time. So, we are reviewing documents, reviewing drafts and hopefully we will report to the Court pretty soon that we have reached a tolling agreement.

2.0

Next is the status of state cases. I think
Mr. Pratt touched on it. The only thing I would add to
that is we understand there are 27 cases in the State
Courts, several of them in the state of Texas and
several in the state of Minnesota. They are scattered
into Ramsey County and into Hennepin County, and that is
basically the status of the number of cases that are in
State Court.

And at this point, there seems to be a great deal of cooperation between the State Court Judges and the Federal Court to limit the amount of duplicate discovery that might take place in dual tracks.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: And I will just repeat what we said in the conference, Judge Boylan and myself, not just because we are former state colleagues, not just because it is done in many MDL's, not just because we are actually good friends of, as it turns out, the respective Chief Judges, Wieland in Hennepin,

Greg Johnson, Ramsey, and newly appointed Russ Anderson, Chief Justice. We did say in chambers, we will be reaching out to them in the next few days just to make sure that, to the extent it is appropriate, to coordinate, minimize duplication, so that they can carry out their responsibilities. We will carry out ours.

Because there is some discussion by the State Court of rolling all of these to one judge, whether it is out of the Supreme Court order, as has been done in the past and pick a judge in the state system, or each respective Chief Judge in Ramsey, the Second District, or Hennepin, the Fourth, that is, of course, not our decision to make. But, we will reach out to those three individuals in the next few days.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. The

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. The next issue, just a matter of information, is the master complaint. It is not on the agenda, as such, but counsel has agreed that the date which was originally set for this month, earlier this month, I thought it was the 13th, has been moved to the 21st. The Plaintiffs will file a master complaint on the 21st with the Court, which will incorporate all of the claims that we understand to be before the Court. And we have agreement from counsel as to that day. If there is a day or two of slippage, we will advise; but, that is our

goal, and we think we will make it.

2.0

Part and parcel of that, we had a discussion in chambers about if that creates any page or word limitations, were briefing to have to come to all or a portion of the Complaint, and we let the Court know of our concern that because we're consolidating a lot of different claims, we wanted to make sure that no type of claim got somehow short shrift, or limited in the amount of briefing or the appropriate briefing they can do, giving due consideration that always shorter is better. And that if you can't say it in a short way, it probably isn't best to be said in some fashion.

We are concerned, and we expressed it to the Court, that somehow filing a master complaint would in no way limit people's right to brief appropriately and the Court to give due consideration to those limitations.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: True. True or false? True.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: True.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I don't think you will be able to locate to many lawyers that find that either one of us has taken an arbitrary view in any context.

Of course, it shouldn't either be a license

for some unnecessary replication. I don't think there will be any complaints from either side of the aisle that we will handle anything other than fair. If people need to be heard, they will be heard. And I think we were convinced because Judge Boylan brought up the pros and cons of the one, two and three master complaints. And I think it's -- we are probably on board that the one for the reasons you all stated, so we won't revisit that, make a lot of sense. And we will be sensitive to the concerns that: Well, will this open a door to the Court to put in some unreasonable page limitations? That won't happen.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.

MR. PRATT: Back to the number of State Court cases, I think, Your Honor, you deserve credit for sending up a letter to State Court Judges and encouraging them not to get sort of ahead of the MDL. I know you have made some initiatives in Texas, specifically.

There was some comment made that there are cases in Texas and there are cases in Minnesota, State Court cases; and that is true. But, I think it is, of the 27 State Court cases, they are sort of spread around in 14 different states, and the fact that they are in 14 different states and there is virtually no activity in

```
most of those states I think is attributed in some
1
2
    respects to the fact that these judges are standing
3
    down.
           They realize things are moving ahead with the
4
    MDL, and I know that was one of your objectives, to be
    sure, that State Court Judges don't get ahead. But, the
5
6
    27 cases are spread around over 14 different states.
7
    Most of them have one case in one state, like
8
    California, places like that. But, it seems to be
    working. We are getting new cases filed in Federal
9
10
    Court, as opposed to State Court, so I think that is
    probably a positive development for everybody.
11
12
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I hope so.
13
    hope so.
14
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Tim, you mentioned under
15
    plaintiff fact sheet discussion, and I guess it is at
16
    the tail end of the agenda, too. You indicated there
    were 59 deficiencies. If you could just --
17
18
                            No, 59 of --
                MR. PRATT:
19
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Deficiencies that --
20
                MR. PRATT: For which we have received no
    fact sheets.
21
22
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: 132 deficiency
23
    letters, I think.
24
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: But 59 who have not filed.
25
    If you could just favor us with those names, we will
```

make the effort immediately to notify them and to get them appropriately filed. So, give us the names of those 59 as quickly as you can and we will work to make sure they get filed.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: If I may just -not on that topic, but for those of you that weren't
here or haven't snooped around on the website, the
letter that was sent out to -- the same letter was sent
to every judge, but they were individually sent with
individual names. It wasn't just one mass letter sent
with every Judge's name. But, the letter that was sent
that Mr. Pratt referred to is on the website if you are
curious, well, what was the communication. It is on the
web.

Mr. Pratt, you kind of headed for the microphone, so I don't know --

MR. PRATT: Well, the deals are five and six that I think we started it, so we can end the discussion with it fairly quickly if Your Honor permits. And the information we have is that we have received plaintiff fact sheets on 148 individual Plaintiffs, for which we submitted 132 deficiency letters, because we believed they were incomplete, some in small respects, many in significant respects. Only about a third of those did we even get medical records that accompanied the

plaintiff fact sheets.

Of the deficiency letters, the 132 we sent out, to this date, 77 have not even responded to the deficiency letter. Many have, in good faith they are getting us more information.

There are 59 Plaintiffs for which plaintiff fact sheets are due, and we received no fact sheet, whatsoever. As I explained to Your Honor this morning, our plan was to file motions to dismiss all of those 59 Plaintiffs on the grounds that they violated the Pretrial Order, missed the deadline.

As we discussed matters this morning with Mr. Zimmerman and other lead counsel on the Plaintiffs' side, we agreed to give them a list of those missing fact sheets of Plaintiffs to counsel, which we will do within 24 hours. They will then see what they can do about correcting that deficiency. But, in a short period of time we may be compelled, if we don't get them, to file a motion to dismiss. Because either the Plaintiffs are in or they are out as a part of this whole bellwether discussion process. But, we are, in the meantime, we are going to try to work with the Steering Committee to get complete fact sheets.

THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN: The record should reflect the fact that the Court indicated

that in our view we thought it was very important to get those fact sheets in. We are interested in getting those bellwether cases identified and keeping this matter on track.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.

The next item, Your Honor, is the discovery status. It really breaks down into documents and depositions. With regard -- I will report on the documents, and Richard Arsenault will report on the depositions.

The document depository, Your Honor, has 3.6 million documents now provided by Defense to us. We have a depository set up that is a total electronic depository; that is, all documents can be reviewed on computer screens and they can be reviewed remotely, as well. In other words, you don't have to be in the depository.

We have been reviewing documents steadily.

This system had a couple of little bugs coming in on the first day we had people show up, we've worked those out.

We have what we consider a very efficient review program, coding program, and hot document program. I don't want to go into any greater detail, because it is proprietary to the PSC, but the documents are coming in fast and furious. The documents are being reviewed

electronically. And we have a depository up and running at the Gaviidae Center in Minneapolis adjacent to our offices, but not part of our office. It is a separate place.

We are very happy with the participation of Plaintiffs' counsel in the review process. And although there have been a couple of delays in getting some of the documents we want that are important, we have a commitment, especially on the Independent Panel documents that had been ordered, that the documents that went to the Independent Panel that went into their report entitled, "Report of the Independent Panel of Guidant Corporation," dated March 20, we wanted the supporting documents that went to the panel.

We have a commitment this morning from Mr.

Pratt that those will be provided to us within, I think,

a week or ten days. So, that is a very good and

important development. And documents continue to come

in and get reviewed.

We will give you the report on the depositions so you know where we are and counsel around the country know where we are, and then Tim you can comment, or anyone from your side.

MR. ARSENAULT: Good morning, Your Honor, it is Richard Arsenault, Lead Counsel Committee. Early on

we wanted to begin with corporate depositions, Rule 30(b)6 depositions. We identified five areas where we were going to initially conduct these Rule 30(b)6 depositions. We did that.

We have now concluded three of those five depositions, the first of which was the information technology and document management 30(b)6 deposition, and then there was a medical advisory 30(b)6 deposition, and then just this week we concluded the warranties of a 30(b)6 deposition.

We are still in the process of getting dates, and I think the Defendants are in the process of identifying representatives who will testify in their 30(b)6 capacity, and that will be in the sales and marketing and the communications with regulatory agencies.

We have also identified a number of individuals who will be deposed within the next, hopefully, month or two. There is an engineer who is being deposed, as we speak in San Francisco, a Rocco Russini. There are six depositions that we are in the process of identifying dates and times and logistics and custodial files. And those are Dr. Beverly Laurel, she is the Vice-President Chief Medical Technology Officer; Michael Flanagan, a technical services person; Reynold

Russie, an engineer; Alan Gorsett, Vice-President of
Reliability and Quality Assurance; Dale DeVries,
Vice-President of Clinicals and Regulatory Affairs; and
Dan Tisch, manager of Product Performance.

Also, Your Honor, there has been about over a dozen third-party subpoenas that have gone out to a variety of nonparties. And those documents are coming in with regularity. Lastly, as we begin to review more of these documents, the need for depositions and the need for -- the identification of those people who should be deposed becomes clearer to us. And we are working on a constant real-time basis to identify those people consistent with the document review that is taking place.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Thank you.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: I was just reminded of two other things. One is, we also had a discussion regarding the crematorium review and the downloading of the information that was seized from the documents that were -- the devices that were in the crematorium. We have a commitment that that information will be forthcoming.

What I am really referring to is, there are a number of devices that were found to be in crematoriums that were taken from people who had died, who had to

have the devices removed before they were cremated.

Those devices were subpoenaed and the information from those devices downloaded by Guidant. And we now have agreement that that information, the downloaded information from those devices will be provided to us in a very short period of time.

2.0

Secondly, Your Honor, I just want everyone to know on the record that anyone who is a member, who has a federal case and has a case in the MDL can review documents in the document depository. So, we are open for business and we are available for review.

The one issue that people need to know is that some of the documents are large documents so that when you open the document, it will -- say it is a color PowerPoint, it takes some time to open that document if you are trying to do it remotely. So, that was a little bit of a problem for us to get enough pipe, enough width, broadband width to be able to get those documents opened quickly and reviewed.

We have solved that problem, but will never be completely solved, because if it is a color PowerPoint, it is just going to take more time than, say, a black and white e-mail. But, I think that the system is working very well. I, for one, am very happy with it and happy that it has as few bugs in it and it

1 is operational at this time. And I think that the 2 depository is available for anyone with a federal case 3 who wants to use it. Seth, was there anything more on 4 the depository? MR. LESSER: No, that is it. And Bucky 5 6 actually is, I think it is fair to say, almost 7 minimizing the extent that some of these documents, 8 maybe we live in an electronic age, but one has to appreciate these documents were enormous, there are 9 10 single documents, single files one gigabyte large. There are multiple documents in the tens and hundreds of 11 12 millions of megabytes large. Those are enormous files. 13 So, of course, as Bucky pointed out, if any Plaintiffs' counsel wishes to read those documents 14 remotely, they have to appreciate and understand that 15 16 documents that long, given -- and with that existence at 17 least in the world today might take a few minutes to 18 load. 19 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Mr. Pratt? 20 MR. PRATT: Well, if there is a problem of 21 too many documents being produced to the Plaintiff's 22 Steering Committee, Your Honor --23 THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: The phrase was

MR. PRATT: I have got a solution and I am

24

fast and furious.

pleased that we are at least making some inroads into satisfying the insatiable appetite of my colleagues on that side for information and documents.

Mr. Carpenter, if we may, Your Honor, will comment on some of the discovery situations.

MR. CARPENTER: Your Honors, Plaintiffs are accurate in their assessment of the current discovery situation. Just one brief clarification. We are going to get to the Plaintiffs the majority of the Independent Panel documents within a week or ten days. The one difficulty and the one caveat I do want to make is as we explained earlier at our prior meeting, we are still working to identify not just the documents that were initially sent to the panel, we have identified those and will be able to produce those within a week or so but we are also trying to make sure we can identify subsequently produced panel documents, as well.

So, what Plaintiffs will be getting in a week to ten days will be most of them. And we are working as fast as we can to identify the full range of any additional subsequently produced to the Independent Panel documents, and we will be producing those as soon as we identify them.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MR. PRATT: One quick matter, Your Honor, and

I am springing it on the lead counsel, here, but it is going to be a matter we need to discuss.

In the Texas cases, there were three senior people deposed, Fred McCoy who is the president of Guidant, Joe Smith, Chief Medical Officer, and Al Gorsett, who is the Vice-President in charge of Reliability.

Most of the people they have asked for by name are individuals who have not been deposed. Mr. Gorsett they have asked for by name. He had been deposed for five hours. We are going to engage in a discussion with the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee on limiting the time and topics of previously deposed company witnesses.

I don't think we can treat Mr. Gorsette as we would Mr. DeVries, for example, who has not been deposed, so we are going to engage some discussion with them on whether they're -- perhaps they need less time with the witness who has already been deposed. And perhaps there are some topics that have already been exhausted in the earlier deposition that need not be revisited. I think in the spirit of cooperation we can reach some agreement on that. If not, we may have a moment of your time to discuss what we might be able to do with it.

actually, that was one of the issues, not those particular ones addressed in that letter to State Judges, because whether it is coming from their side or our side on the Federal Bench, one risk is not just duplicity, but deposing people prematurely when neither side was vested with very much -- with the information you would hope to have. So, it probably just confirms that the more we can coordinate and cooperate, likely everybody benefits on both sides of the aisle of this.

MR. PRATT: Unfortunately, I think, it is only a historical problem now, because we have no State Court scheduling order that is pressing us for company witness depositions at that level. That may change next week, but it looks like now we are on a path for these company witnesses to be deposed for the first time and I hope the only time in the MDL setting here, so I think that is an accomplishment.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: And in response to what Mr. Pratt said we will simply work with you on trying to find appropriate and reasonable guidelines for depositions of people who have been previously taken in other proceedings.

And we will use our best efforts and exercise good faith.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right.

MR. ZIMMERMAN: The next item, Your Honor, i bellwether representative trial planning and summary jury trials. This is a key issue in this MDL, Your Honor. We are meeting this afternoon, immediately following this conference with counsel to discuss at least the plaintiffs view of how bellwether should be categorized and selected.

We believe we will have a meaningful discussion. It is going to go from immediately following this conference to about 12:30 today when people have to break to hit plains. If we do not resolve it by that time, we will meet again very soon. If at the end of that process we cannot come to a complete agreement on the process for selecting bellwethers, and the categories of bellwethers or instructive trials, we will immediately bring that to the Court for direction and resolution of those issues.

It is key that we bring this process to a head. It is key that we make it to agreement, rather than going into any other kind of system, because it is the quality of the selection process, and it is the representativeness of these bellwether cases that will be so helpful in us in ultimately getting to the end of this litigation and resolving the important issues that

we confront. We are prepared to meet. They are prepared to meet. If we all meet in good faith, hopefully we will get it done. If we don't get it done, you will hear from us and we will ask you to help us bridge the gap.

MR. PRATT: I really have nothing much more to add to that. Yes, we will meet with our proposal as well. I think the Defendants have their thoughts on how these bellwether matters ought to proceed we understand the Court's instruction what you all expect of us as counsel. I think we can make some inroads, at least, into limiting the number of disputes that we have and selecting the process that is as fair as it can be. Also we're going to discuss getting the information we need in order to participate meaningfully in the selection process. That will be part of what we are going to discuss today, as well.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I don't think we need to repeat or respond, because we had a very, I think, positive and constructive discussion this morning. And I would refer, if in your idle hours or minutes for those of you who haven't, our last order, pretrial order number 8 that was filed and is on the web on March 23rd addressed solely this issue. And the only modification of that would be that to the extent that we

had at paragraph 3 of that order that within one week of this conference that we would -- we would proceed to setting and selecting the cases, I think it is understood implicitly, in light of the efforts that both sides are making, and we all have a meeting of the minds that this is key to, one, responding to all of the Plaintiffs, and maybe most importantly for keeping us on track for trying cases in March of 2007. And kind of the theme of the order back in March is that, yes, there are some MDL's that when all else fails, they randomly But, randomly selecting out of agreed select cases. upon categories that are truly representative and proportionately representative is one thing, as I think we all agree, randomly selecting, because we can't figure out another way to do it regardless of the categories I don't think it will serve anyone's interest. But, I think enough has probably been said. I think we are on the right track. And like you told the two of us this morning

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And like you told the two of us this morning you are going to head right into a conference when we are done here to take a look at that process, so --

MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you. The next issue on at agenda, Your Honor, is ADR. And we have had some preliminary discussions. We have really nothing definitive to report, other than it is in the air, and

we are looking at ideas and nothing has been agreed to at this point, but we are simply having discussions as to how it might work in the future.

Plaintiff fact sheets, I think we have beaten that one to death. I think the word has gotten out that it is an obligation that we must take seriously on the Plaintiffs' side. And the Defendants and the Plaintiffs will cooperate to make sure plaintiff fact sheets are appropriately filled out, filed, and timely completed.

Your Honor, that completes the formal agenda, unless anybody in the courtroom or anybody from the Bench has any questions, that's --

THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Well, let's do three things, and Judge Boylan may. Have others, but don't get worried, now, there is not a secret category down here.

Is there anything -- for the people that were in the meeting this morning, this is just a repeat question that we asked each of you. And so, I think, I believe I know the answer to the question. And then I will open it up to the rest of the courtroom.

Is there anything else that given the dates we have set, the existing orders in place, that the Court can do or should be doing that we haven't discussed? Or do you think that, at least at this

```
1
    time, we are moving forward? Or is there something you
2
    need us to do?
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: From the Plaintiffs'
 3
4
    perspective, I don't -- oh, there might be a conflict.
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Be careful what
 5
6
    you ask for.
7
                MR. ARSENAULT: This is just something Mr.
    Pratt raised and we wanted to make certain.
                                                  We have
8
    noticed or are in the process of noticing Al Gorsett.
9
10
    And we will make reasonable accommodations in certainly
    not going through testimony in any more detail than we
11
12
    need to, unless there has been some new documents or
13
    anything like that. But, we just want to make certain
    that we do in fact have those transcripts and all of the
14
    associated exhibits. We were perhaps mistakenly under
15
16
    the impression there might have been a fourth
17
    deposition, as well, but we will get with your staff to
18
    make sure that --
                MR. PRATT: I don't think Mr. Stone was
19
20
    deposed. I think that was the fourth. He was not.
21
                MR. ARSENAULT:
                                All right. So, we will work
22
    with Mr. Pratt to make sure we have those transcripts,
23
    all the exhibits and try to reach some reasonable
24
    accommodation.
25
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: But, other than that, in
```

```
1
    answer to your question, Your Honor, no. I mean,
2
    doughnuts in the morning would be nice.
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right, well,
 3
    we will work on that.
4
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: Other than that, we felt very
5
    much heard. And the pace and the coordination and the
6
7
    supervision of the cases are working very well and we
8
    are very thankful of the cooperation of both sides and
    from the Bench.
9
10
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: Mr. Pratt, same
11
    question.
12
                MR. PRATT: The Defendants think that both of
13
    you are doing a fabulous job.
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK:
14
                                            Some good
    old-fashioned schmoozing at the end of a conference --
15
16
                MR. PRATT: You asked.
17
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: I was hoping that
18
    wasn't a question, but if I may, are there any other
19
    counsel that were assuming they would have a right to be
20
    heard this morning and want to raise any issue?
    that doesn't mean -- silence does not mean everything is
21
22
    all -- Gale, go ahead.
23
                MS. PEARSON: Hi, and I don't want to raise
24
    any issue, but I just have a question --
25
                THE HONORABLE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BOYLAN:
                                                         Gale,
```

why don't you identify yourself for the court reporter?

MS. PEARSON: Thank you. My name is Gale

Pearson and I have cases, and State Court case in

Minnesota. And I was just questioning, in the Medtronic

cases where we have got -- we are coordinating our

discovery, the State Court cases are getting

cross-noticed in the depositions for the Medtronic

cases. I was just questioning whether or not the State

Court cases are also going to be cross-noticed in the

Guidant Depositions.

In the Medtronic cases we are working with Defendant for an opportunity to be hear. I haven't received any notices at this point, and I'm sure it is not an issue, it is just because I haven't received any notices yet.

In the State Court cases in Medtronic, there is a discussion going on about giving an opportunity to the State Court attorneys at some time during the deposition process to ask question that they may feel is important to their particular case. And I'm just raising that as a question, just to think about. Thank you.

Not an uncommon practice, Ms. Pearson, I think we would agree, in some of these MDL's, whether it is Medtronic or others. I mean, I think there is more

```
than one way to handle it. But, I think it is a fair
1
2
    issue to raise. Anyone want to respond to it today?
                MR. ZIMMERMAN: We will give it due
3
    consideration, for sure.
4
                THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANK: All right, thank
5
6
    you.
7
                Anything further on behalf of either
    Plaintiffs, Defendants, from the gallery or from counsel
8
9
    table? All right. We will adjourn.
                We thank you all for your presence and we
10
11
    will see you soon. Thank you.
12
                ALL COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.
13
                (Adjournment.)
14
15
16
17
                Certified by:
18
                              Jeanne M. Anderson, RMR-RPR
                              Official Court Reporter
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```